

Remarks

Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-2 and 11-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,064,656 of *Angal et al.* ("*Angal*").

Claims 3-4 and 13-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Angal* and U.S. Patent No. 6,427,168 of *McCollum* ("*McCollum*").

Claims 5-10 and 15-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Angal* and U.S. Patent No. 6,459,700 of *Hoang* ("*Hoang*").

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-2 and 11-12 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) in view of *Angal*. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is not anticipated by *Angal* because *Angal* does not disclose a method for obtaining information useful for management of a composite e-service as claimed in claim 1. Instead, *Angal* discloses a system for controlling access to management objects in a network. (*Angal*, col. 3, lines 20-25). The management objects of *Angal* are not a composite e-service as claimed in claim 1. Instead, *Angal* explicitly states that

for the purposes of this document, we are only concerned with management objects in the network, which contain management information and resource control variables. (*Angal*, col. 4, lines 50-53).

In addition, the method of claim 1 includes the limitation of generating a set of management information for each of a set of service interactions among a set of e-services in a composite e-service. *Angal* does not teach generating management information for service interactions among e-services in a composite e-service as claimed in claim 1. Instead, *Angal* teaches generating event notifications for events that are not related to service interactions of a composite e-service. For example, *Angal* discloses event notification when disk space falls below a threshold. (*Angal*, col. 1, lines 38-40). It is submitted that the event

the remarks stated above with respect to claim 1 also apply to claim 11.

Given that claims 12-20 depend from claim 11, it is submitted that claims 12-20 are not anticipated by *Angal*.

Applicants further submit that claim 1 is not obvious in view of *Angal* and *McCollum* because *Angal* and *McCollum* do not disclose or suggest a method for obtaining information useful for management of a composite e-service as claimed in claim 1. Instead, *Angal* teaches a system for controlling access to management objects in a network (*Angal*, col. 3, lines 20-25) and *McCollum* teaches a centralized performance monitoring system (*McCollum*, col. 2, lines 6-13).

Given that claims 2-10 depend from claim 1, it is submitted that claims 2-10 are not obvious in view of *Angal* and *McCollum*.

It is also submitted that claim 11 is not obvious in view of *Angal* and *McCollum*. Claim 11 is a composite e-service that includes limitations similar to the limitations of claim 1. Therefore, the remarks stated above with respect to claim 1 and *Angal* and *McCollum* also apply to claim 11.

Given that claims 12-20 depend from claim 11, it is submitted that claims 12-20 are not obvious in view of *Angal* and *McCollum*.

Applicants further submit that claim 1 is not obvious in view of *Angal* and *Hoang* because *Angal* and *Hoang* do not disclose or suggest a method for obtaining information useful for management of a composite e-service as claimed in claim 1. Instead, *Angal* teaches a system for controlling access to management objects in a network (*Angal*, col. 3, lines 20-25) and *Hoang* discloses a repeater device for network communication (*Hoang*, col. 2, lines 62-65).

Given that claims 2-10 depend from claim 1, it is submitted that claims 2-10 are not obvious in view of *Angal* and *Hoang*.

It is also submitted that claim 11 is not obvious in view

of *Angal* and *Hoang*. Claim 11 is a composite e-service that includes limitations similar to the limitations of claim 1. Therefore, the remarks stated above with respect to claim 1 and *Angal* and *Hoang* also apply to claim 11.

Given that claims 12-20 depend from claim 11, it is submitted that claims 12-20 are not obvious in view of *Angal* and *Hoang*.

It is respectfully submitted that in view of the amendments and arguments set forth above, the applicable rejections have been overcome.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-2025 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 2-20-04

By: _____

Paul H. Horstmann

Paul H. Horstmann

Reg. No.: 36,167



Creation date: 07-13-2004
Indexing Officer: TLAM2 - THY LAM
Team: OIPEBackFileIndexing
Dossier: 09651519

Legal Date: 03-06-2004

No.	Doccode	Number of pages
1	SRNT	2

Total number of pages: 2

Remarks:

Order of re-scan issued on